



REV. D. V. LUCAS, D.D.,
OF TORONTO, CANADA.

WINE BAD AND GOOD

BY

REV. D. V. LUCAS, D.D.,

OF TORONTO, CANADA,

AUTHOR OF

"The Class Meeting," "Railway Sermons," "All About Canada," "The
Twins," "Australia and Homeward," Etc.

PRICE 10 CENTS

TORONTO:

Printed at the Methodist Book and Publishing House, Wesley Buildings.

1891.

HV5180
L82

2096

LUCAS, D.V.

Entered, according to Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, by WILLIAM BRIGGS, in the Office of the Minister of Agriculture, at Ottawa.

WINE! BAD AND GOOD.

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST has been belied
and vilely slandered.

If this had occurred in the house of His enemies only, we might have allowed it to pass; but His friends have believed the lie, and so, assenting to it, have unintentionally wronged their Master and the race whom He came to save.

AVARICE *and* APPETITE have united to persuade men that the Saviour of mankind made, drank, and gave to others to drink, liquids that had in them an intoxicating element, which is so contradictory to His revealed will, that I am amazed Christian people should have assented to it so long, especially when such havoc has been wrought among mankind by the use of intoxicants.

That audacity which was seen in the arch-fiend in Eden, when he beguiled our pure progenitors into eating what was strictly forbidden, has been seen again in his efforts to deceive their offspring respecting the drinking of that which is forbidden.

The children have also seen that what was forbidden, was "*good for food*" and pleasant to the eyes, and something to be desired to make them wise; and they, too, have been caught in his trap, not in pairs merely, but in millions. So his later scheme for catching men has been as successful as the first.

Jesus Christ came to destroy the works of the devil; but if the old serpent can persuade men that Jesus is on his side in this the wisest of all his plans for the ruin of the redeemed race, you may be sure he chuckles over his consummate skill.

It needs little argument to show the bad tendency of intoxicating beverages.

Will any man maintain for a moment that there is anything in Christ or Christianity that has in it a bad tendency?

There is nothing in Christ or his religion calculated to tempt men to sin.

His religion is man's friend. Its ordinances are to him channels of blessing, intended to save him from sin.

If intoxicating wine is found to be a tempter, to be a mocker and a cause of stumbling, then it cannot belong to Him ; for being a tempter to sin, it must be classed with the world, the flesh and the devil.

Dr. Farrar, in his tract, "THE NATION'S CURSE," tells us there are 600,000 drunkards in England, and says also, that "for twopence you can purchase the record of events which drink caused for two weeks during Christmas holidays. Here you have for two weeks in England alone thirty-six pages of stabbing, cutting, wounding; of brutal assaults on women and children; of public perils and accidents; of deaths sudden and preventible; of homicide; of parricide; of matricide; of infanticide; of suicide and every form of murder."

He further says, "In four hours, on one evening in only one city, thirty-six thousand eight hundred and three women (36,803) were seen going into the public-houses of that city. The results form a tragedy so squalid and so deadly as to sicken the heart.

"Read that hideous list, and then prattle, and lisp, and sneer about exaggeration.

"Read that list, and then quote Scripture for the purpose of checking temperance reformers, or for encouraging delay" in uprooting this chief engine of the devil for human destruction.

"Read that list, and then, if any minister of Christ can still quote Scripture to show that his Master gave in the least degree His sanction and encouragement to the use of intoxicating beverages,

"Though in the sacred place he stands,
Uplifting consecrated hands,
Unworthy are his lips to tell,
Of Jesus' martyr-miracle,
Thy miracle of life and death,
Thou Holy One of Nazareth."

The sooner the world sees the last of such ministers the better for the world.

What possible resemblance is there? What faintest connection or relationship between the pandemonium, the hellish din of the liquor traffic and the blessed song of the angels over Bethlehem's plains, when Jesus was born, "Glory to God in the highest ; peace on earth ; good-will to men?"

Let no one think that the record given above as the result of drinking in England, has no application at all to Canada. The fruits of the traffic are the same wherever the traffic is known. Though our case may

not be quite so bad, it is bad enough to bring the blush of shame to every thoughtful Christian.

Take Toronto's record for Christmas, 1889, and the twelve months preceding, for a few specimens of the evil, not by a long way for a full and complete record of the extent of it. The following are quoted from our city papers :

TORONTO A DRUNKEN CITY.

"Toronto was a very drunken town last night—disgracefully so. The number of drunken men on the streets was appalling ; the number of drunken women alarming ; the number of drunken children atrocious. Crowds of drunken men reeled along the streets ; women, unsexed by liquor, cursed and fought with men rendered brutes from the same cause ; and even children—lads of not more than twelve years of age, to the everlasting disgrace of this city—were seen as drunk as their elders. The City of Churches should hide its swollen head in shame this morning."—Dec. 26.

THE DRUNKS WERE TOO NUMEROUS.

"Notwithstanding the throngs of drunken people who lined the streets and stood at almost every corner, there were few arrests for drunkenness yesterday, the police contenting themselves with keeping the crowd upon the move. The reason is obvious, it would have been simply impossible to have found accommodation for all who might have been arrested upon this charge."—Dec. 26.

THE POLICE COURT.

"Justice of the Peace Miller held court yesterday, and gladdened the hearts of sixteen drunks by liberating them. They were all admonished, and warned not to get drunk again. E. B—— was the only prisoner held; he was charged with having smashed the windows of 595 Queen Street West, and will explain his action to the police magistrate this morning."—Dec. 26.

Three little girls stop a policeman and beg to be arrested, that they might be put in jail, where they could get something to eat and have protection, for their father and mother were drunk all the time, and they had nobody to care for them.

A woman is obliged to stand in the Police Court and testify against her husband for beating her, although she had to earn the money to pay the rent and buy the bread for seven children and for the man from whom she had to endure these blows every time he came home from the grog shops of this Christian city.

At the same time a young woman appeared in the same court to ask His Honor to protect her against her husband, a handsome young man, who was tempted into our saloons, and *she* had to suffer the consequences in beatings and bruises.

Here are a father and mother in court because of drink, and the poor children are there to witness the wrangle between their parents.

Elizabeth E—— jumps into the bay to drown herself, because of delirium tremens.

Lillie K—— hangs herself in her cell because of drink.

Mary B—— jumped from a window because of delirium tremens, and is killed.—October 6.

Ed. K—— murders his wife through drink.

John H., while drunk, cruelly beat his wife over the head with a heavy walking stick.

There were two dozen drunks in the cells last night, the net results of the day's festivities, among them a young girl not yet sixteen.—August 13.

David McL——, found dead. After hearing the evidence, "the jury returned a verdict that the deceased had suicided under the influence of liquor."—October 29th.

L. B——, while on a spree, assaulted an old woman, and nearly beat her to death.—September 24th.

Alice T——, found dead; taken to the morgue. Verdict, excessive use of liquor and want of food.—September 11th.

Mr. S. P——, barrister, was locked up yesterday on a charge of larceny. Mr. P—— has been indulging in liquor to great excess of late. He was on the verge of delirium tremens.

AFRAID OF HER HUSBAND.—Ed. M——'s wife says he never misses a chance to get drunk. She asked for an order of protection against him.

Annie G—— had two very black eyes, as she stood in the dock. Had been drunk.

Margaret McC——, very drunk; attempted to suicide in her cell.

There were six *new* drunks on the list this morning.—Monday.

Sarah S—— is a very old offender. She has never missed an opportunity of getting drunk.

Joseph E——, very drunk—locked up. When sober, found himself charged with larceny and horse-stealing. He could not account for his possession of the stolen property.

Mrs. R——, the wife of a respectable citizen, driven crazy with whiskey, tried last night to suicide.—December 27th.

And yet Toronto is reputed to be the most Christian city on this continent.

If such things are the almost daily result of the traffic in Toronto, what may we expect from elsewhere? Well have our Presbyterian brethren said in the General Assembly :

“The liquor traffic is contrary to the Word of God and the spirit of the Christian religion, and there is no cure for it but total prohibition.”

I ground my argument that Jesus had, and has no share in it, in any measure or form whatever, first of all, on this palpable and awful contrariety between the tendency of intoxicating drinks and His life, His character, His mission, and His teachings.

Secondly, on the equity and righteousness of a general judgment.

I believe the doctrine that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ ; that every secret thing shall be judged, and that we shall be judged, small and great, according to our works.

Do you not see, my reader, what immense responsibility rests upon the human brain through every waking moment ?

The brain which carries such responsibility needs all its native power, to enable it in a world like this, where right and wrong, in ten thousand ways, are continually contending, to enable it, I say, in the midst of all this strife, to distinguish at all times between what is right and what is wrong.

I do not mean merely to be able to distinguish between philanthropy on the one hand and murder on the other, for even an idiot might do that ; but those nicer and finer distinctions between good and bad influences which affect us in a greater or lesser degree, for our welfare or injury, through our whole life.

There had been a party. Next day the whole town was talking of the insult of which Mr. Blank had been guilty to all assembled, but particularly to the ladies. Mr. B—— had always borne the reputation of a gentleman, and was personally liked by the people, but his offensive words and conduct were so

uncalled for, and so inexcusable, that nothing but condemnation was heard upon the street, of his lewd conversation and vile blasphemy before all the guests, until a friend checked somewhat the sharp criticisms, by remarking, "You must be more charitable towards our mutual friend, who is really a good fellow, and, generally speaking, a perfect gentleman. He had taken one glass too much." One glass of what, pray? One glass of something which He sanctioned before whose judgment seat we must all appear, to give an account of our conduct here?

It will occur to the mind of the honest reader, that a just judge would not do that which would result in creating the offence for which the offender must be brought before him to be condemned.

"But he should not take too much."

Too much! What is too much?

Give a glass of your bad wine to one, unused to its taste and influence, and that one glass is too much. The equilibrium of the brain is to some degree impaired, and immediately loses, to some extent, the susceptibility of good influences which it had before.

To a brain so responsible, needing all its native powers every moment we are awake, to so direct our lives through this world, where right and wrong are

continually contending for the mastery, think you Jesus, the Saviour of men, encouraged even the taking of that one?

The thoughtful lover of Jesus recoils instinctively from the suggestion that his Lord could ever have in any sense encouraged the use of that which at parties and in public places, in the home and in the saloon, on the land and on the sea, has been more productive of lewdness and profanity, and sin of every sort, than any other thing known in Christendom?

That which has led, and is at this day leading, tens of thousands of poor heathens to look upon *Christian* and *drunkard* as terms synonymous.

Notwithstanding all the wrong done to the good name of the holy and loving Redeemer, and the ruin wrought by the use of intoxicating wine, in how many Christian families is it still used? I pray you, father or mother, read with much care what I here write, for these lines are written with the sincere prayer and hope that the wrong done our Master in the past may be in some measure atoned, and that the temptations hitherto set before our children may be abolished.

All intoxicating beverages are contrary to the Word of God, and are by His Word prohibited; a truth

which has in some way been overlooked by many well-meaning people.

The use of wine that can intoxicate is condemned and denounced by the teachings of *Holy Scriptures*.

"Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause?"

"They that tarry long at the wine."

"There you have your answer," says some one.

"They that *tarry long*."

"Is it not clear enough that it is the tarrying long that is condemned?"

I beg your pardon, sir, it is not the tarrying long that is here prohibited.

I have found no passage of Scripture which tells you not to tarry long at the wine. God does not so deal with what is wrong.

Can you find me one passage of Holy Writ which commands or enjoins upon me not to swear much, or not to steal much, or not to kill much?

"What! Does God's Word say that wine produces woe, and sorrow, and wounds, and babbling, and does He give no command respecting the use of it?"

O yes, He commands, but His command is, "Look not thou upon the wine WHEN." I need not quote in

full. All know what is meant. *When* it has in it the element which produces the miseries named.

When it possesses that power, inspiration tells us that it is a mocker, a serpent and adder. It deceiveth, it biteth, it stingeth, it poisons.

Millions of very nice people have construed the word to mean that the prohibition was aimed at the *tarry*, while the writer's real meaning aimed, in the prohibitory sense, at quite another thing. Look not on it in the sense of desiring it. Have nothing to do with it, lest if you have you may tarry, and so reap the whirlwind of sorrow embraced in the list given.

To put it in another way, God says, "Don't keep a tiger in your house."

But you say, "I can keep a tiger in my house if I keep him chained. Can't I?"

God says, "Don't keep a tiger, lest he may break the chain and injure you or your children."

But you say, "But if I do really keep him chained, and he does not break loose, am I doing wrong then?"

Yes, because God says, "Don't keep a tiger in your house."

How many millions of poor souls who might have been saved are now in the pit of hell, because they thought themselves wiser than God?

How many parents have gone down to their graves mourning over ruined sons, and daughters, too, bitten at their own firesides and around their own parental table, by this untamed beast, who, like that other demon we read of, hath hitherto broken all chains with which men have thought to bind him?

But you say, "Does not God speak approvingly of wine, and so commend it?"

Commend! Commend what? Commend what He condemns! That cannot be.

Can He blow hot and cold with the same breath?

Surely, if He condemns anything to the extent of calling it a mocker, a serpent and adder, and warns us not even to look on it, to desire it, we must have strange notions respecting the truthfulness and consistency of the Almighty if we can think of Him as commending that thing which He in such forcible language, has condemned and prohibited. We have got between the horns of a perplexing dilemma. We don't want to think the Almighty inconsistent with Himself, but what shall we say if He approves and disapproves of the same thing at the same moment and under the same conditions?

What shall we say? Why, say, He does not.

Say this, "If He approves and disapproves two things, those two things must be widely different in their nature."

If He commends and condemns one kind of thing at the same moment, that thing must exist for the time being under two different conditions.

And were there then two kinds of wine, *BAD and GOOD*?

Our respect for Divine integrity forces that belief upon us. We do not necessarily ask for proof. To all believers in the *true* God His own consistency is proof enough that what He condemns must be in a very different condition from what it is in when He commends it. We do not forget, however, that we are to "prove all things."

The proof will be forthcoming. All things which God wants men to believe have behind them abundance of proof.

I have been asked this question, "If there are two kinds of wine, bad and good, as far apart as God's condemnation and God's commendation—which must

oes not.
approves two
y different in
kind of thing
exist for the
s.

ne, *BAD and*

es that belief
or proof. To
consistency is
must be in a
s in when He
er, that we are

things which
them abun-

here are two
art as God's
-which must

be as far apart as blasphemy is from prayer, as far apart as sin is from holiness—then how will you account for the fact that both these things, so different, are called in the Scriptures by the same name, WINE? Did God really intend to deceive men?" No! God never intended to deceive anybody, but He did intend that you and I should search after truth and wisdom as men search after hid treasure.

These two liquors are both entitled to be called "*wine*," because they are both the product of the *vine*, as all sons of Adam claim the right to be called "*man*," because they are sons of Adam. Here is a man. His claim to be called "*man*" is recognized by Scripture because he is an acknowledged son of Adam, but these same Scriptures call him a bad man.

The inexperienced youth is warned against him.

"Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of the evil *man*."

"My son, walk not thou in the way with them; refrain thy foot from their path."

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly."

Here is a man. He is called so because he is a son of Adam, but these Scriptures call him a good man,

and commend his counsel and his example to the youth who before had been warned against the bad man.

My reader will easily see the analogy.

Here is an example of God's condemning and commending the same kind of being, but God's consistency is preserved and holds its place in our esteem, while we recognize the fact that these separate individuals of the great race of man were existing under two widely different conditions.

The bad man is not what he was originally. Being fallen from that condition, he is condemned.

* The wine which has in it the power to produce woe and sorrow and wounds, is not what it was originally. Being changed from its primitive condition, and possessing now the nature of the serpent and adder, it is condemned and its use prohibited, as dangerous and terribly destructive of man's welfare and happiness.

But can it be shown that there were two kinds of wine?

Two kinds? Yes, and many more than two kinds, for that matter.

Nehemiah uses these words, "Store of all sorts of wine."

So there must have been at least two, and apparently several.

In some instances the word "*wine*" in our translation represents a solid rather than a liquid. For grapes dried and pressed into cakes have been in a few instances called "*wine*" in our English Bible. No great wrong has been done, for all is of the vine.

But can it be shown that some of these kinds were not intoxicating?

Is the expression, "*unfermented wine*" a correct one in the Scriptural sense?

Some have said that there can be no such thing as unfermented wine, assuming that "*wine*" is necessarily a fermented thing.

Such persons have surely given the subject little thought, or they would have seen that the word "*wine*," if so viewed, forces inconsistency and contradiction on the Divine Being.

We are relieved, however, from all such difficulty by even a little careful consideration of a few passages of Scripture.

Isaiah lxxv. 8: "Thus, saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing is in it."

Now, wine in the cluster cannot produce "woe and sorrow and wounds."

It is not a "mocker, serpent and adder."

Here is something called "*wine*" which must have been very unlike that referred to in the 20th and 23rd chapters of Proverbs, and elsewhere in the Bible.

Here is something called "*wine*" which could not have been fermented, for that would have been a chemical impossibility while in the cluster.

Jacob said of the Great One who was to spring from the loins of Judah, "Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine ; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes."

Here is an allusion to the treading of grapes. Liquid forced by pressure out of the grape could not at that moment have been in a fermented condition, and yet it is called "*wine*."

"Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase. So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." (Prov. iii. 9, 10.) The presses were to

burst out with "*wine*," but winepresses do not send forth abundantly of that which is fermented.

Isaiah, mourning over the sins of Moab, and the judgments to be sent or blessings withheld because of her sins, says, "I will water thee with my tears, O Heshbon, and Elealah : for the shouting for thy summer fruits and for thy harvest is fallen. And gladness is taken away, and joy out of the plentiful field; and in the vineyards there shall be no singing, neither shall there be shouting : the treaders shall tread out no wine in their presses ; I have made their vintage shouting to cease." (Isaiah xvi. 9, 10.)

Who will dare to say that the "*wine*" here called such was a fermented liquid ?

So also Jeremiah, " The spoiler is fallen upon thy summer fruits and upon thy vintage. And joy and gladness is taken away from the plentiful field, and from the land of Moab; and I have caused wine to fail from the winepresses; none shall tread with shouting." (Jer. xlviii. 33.)

We have here several instances where the word "*wine*" designates the fresh juice of the grape, and these range over a period of more than a thousand years.

In each instance this unfermented wine is spoken of as a blessing. In Isaiah lxxv. 8, a blessing in hand. In the case of Judah, a blessing promised. In the other instances, a blessing withheld.

Smith, in his Bible Dictionary, says : " The treading was effected by one or more, according to the size of the vat. They encouraged one another by shouts and cries (Isaiah xvi. 10), and their legs and garments were dyed red with the juice." (Gen. xlix. 11 ; Isaiah lxiii. 1, 3.)

The words of the Saviour imply that there was wine that was not fermented. " New wine must be put in new bottles, and both are preserved."

What can His words mean but that the wine was preserved from fermentation and the bottles from bursting? The point of special importance, however, is that unfermented grape juice is, in all these instances, called "*wine*."

We have evidence that in ancient times " the blood of the grape," " the fruit of the vine," unfermented grape juice was used, even by royalty, as a common beverage.

" And the butler told his dream, Behold a vine was before

e is spoken of
ing in hand.
ised. In the

"The tread-
g to the size
ner by shouts
and garments
x. 11; Isaiah

at there was
vine must be
d."

he wine was
bottles from
ce, however,
all these in-

"the blood
nfermented
a common

e was before

me, and in the vine were three branches, and it was as though it budded, and her blossoms shot forth; and the clusters thereof brought forth ripe grapes. And Pharaoh's cup was in my hand: and I took the grapes, and pressed them into Pharaoh's cup, and I gave the cup into Pharaoh's hand.

And Joseph said unto him : This is the interpretation of it: The three branches are three days ; yet within three days shall Pharaoh lift up thine head and restore thee to thy place : and thou shalt deliver Pharaoh's cup into his hand after *the former manner when thou wast his butler.*"

There could be no fermentation here, for the liquid was consumed immediately on its being pressed from the grapes, and the words which I have put in italics reveal the fact that this was a part of the ordinary daily duties of this servant of the king. It does not follow, however, that unless drunk as soon as pressed from the grapes, it could not be had in an unfermented condition, for, as it is said, it would at once ferment.

I beg to remind the reader of the words of our Lord, "And both are preserved."

There was wine then, as there is wine now, preserved from fermentation.

No matter how ; we are assured by One whom no Christian will contradict, that it was.

The late Dr. Freshman (formerly a Rabbi), well known to thousands in Canada, said: "We (the Jews)

used to keep it (wine for the passover) deep in the ground."

I find that in olden times it was by some, after being enclosed in earthen vessels, sunk deep down in the water.

However difficult it may have been, we have the assurance from the lips of the Master Himself that it was.

In these days, with the facilities we have for preserving fruits of all kinds, there is no difficulty at all in preserving the juice of the grape.

I have shown that the king (and I presume also the kings) of Egypt drank as a common beverage the unfermented juice of grapes.

Let us, for a little, turn to Babylon, and there we shall find a different custom, and shall learn probably why it was that Daniel refused to drink the king's wine.

Daniel must have used wine in his own land.

It had been promised as one of the blessings Israel should enjoy from the Divine hand.

There can be no doubt it was commonly used.

Why should Daniel and his companions so suddenly turn from it?

We have only to turn to the feast of Belshazzar to see that the wine of Babylon's king was very different from that of Egypt's king, for the feast which ended so disastrously to Belshazzar and his kingdom was evidently a drunken carousal.

"Babylon . . . that made all the earth drunken : the nations have drunken of her wine ; is suddenly fallen and destroyed." (Jer. li. 7.)

Among the numerous blessings enjoyed by Israel, while obedient, was that of drinking "the pure blood of the grape." (Deut. xxxii. 14.)

Rev. Simeon Reinstein, Rabbi of the Church Street Synagogue in Boston, says :

"In our passover service all fermented liquors are forbidden ; nor are they allowed to be in the house during the seven days of the passover season. The wine which we use in the passover is made from pure raisins, and is unfermented."

The next testimony is from one of the most prominent and intelligent Hebrews in our city, belonging to the extreme Orthodox school. He says :

"In reply to your question concerning the usages of our holy passover, I hereby certify that no fer-

mented liquors are allowed *in our passover services or even in our dwellings*, and in all my experience as a Hebrew I have never known fermented wine to be used in that rite, it being contrary to the law of Moses and all our traditions. I would further refer you for confirmation of my statement to learned rabbis—men of the highest rank and true to the faith of their forefathers: Lord Rothschild, Irving Park, London; Rev. Dr. Marcus Alder, Chief Rabbi, of London; Rev. Dr. Ludac, of Paris; Rev. S. Morais, Philadelphia; Dr. Lowe Bradstans, Kent, Eng.; Rev. H. P. Mendes, New York; Hon. I. P. Solomon, editor of *Hebrew Standard*, New York, and to every Israelite all over the known world who believes in the promised restoration of Zion.

“ALFRED A. MARCUS.

“*Boston Shebai*, 27,

“A. M. 5747.”

Before me, let me suppose, are two bottles of wine.

I draw the cork of one and call to me a young girl of fourteen years.

I ask her to drink a wine-glass full just poured out from this bottle. She does so, and when I ask her if she realizes any difference in her physical condition, she tells me not any more so than if she had taken a glass of milk or lemonade.

I ask her to drink half a wine-glass full from the

other bottle, and immediately she tells me her head is swimming round, that she must sit down or she will fall, that her sight is failing so that she cannot see distinctly, and that she never had such a strange feeling as this before in her life.

"Well," I say, "this is very queer; how do you account for it?"

"Sir," she says, "I don't know how to account for it. I only know that the liquid from the first bottle was to me as water or milk; but the other must have been poison in it, for I feel as if I had been poisoned."

A. MARCUS.

I reply, "My young friend, I filled both these bottles myself. I filled them from wine expressed from ten pounds of grapes all plucked by myself from one vine at the same time."

"Sir, that only makes it more mysterious. I have given you a correct statement as regards my different conditions after taking from the two bottles. I cannot give any reason for this difference."

"Well, my friend, I think we will send for a chemist."

He kindly comes.

I give him a full and complete statement of the case.

He replies that he supposes one bottle was fermented and the other was not.

"But, Mr. Chemist, is that enough to make all this difference? For certainly these two bottles must be in widely different conditions. I filled both bottles myself, from liquid expressed from grapes taken from one vine, all at the one gathering. How do you account for one being fermented and the other not?"

"Oh," he says, "when you filled this first bottle you had your wine boiling hot, and you immediately corked it and sealed it, just as a woman seals up her fruit. Respecting the other bottle, you either did not cork it at all, or you corked it badly, and you left it standing in a temperature of from 60° to 75° for a week or so, and then you corked it. By corking it when you did you saved the alcohol. Had you not interfered with it at all, in a few days more it would have turned to vinegar, especially if the temperature was even slightly increased.

"There is no alcohol in grape juice (pure, good wine) before it ferments, not a particle. Alcohol is nowhere to be found in all the fields of nature until some sweet liquid has begun to ferment or decay.

"To quote from an American Dispensary, 'Alcohol is the product of sugar in a liquid state at a temperature of from 60° to 75° , and the presence of the ferment called vinous fermentation.'

to make all this. "But, Mr. Chemist, I want to know the real difference between these two bottles of wine, which, though both bottles both alike so short a time ago, now must be very different, seeing they affected this young person so differently. Their two conditions must imply two very distinct and widely differing formulæ to have produced effects so varied. What are the constituent parts of the one and of the other? You speak of alcohol. How came alcohol into the one which you said had been badly corked?"

To which the chemist replied: "Good wine has in it a large element of sugar. This, with other constituents, which I shall presently name, makes it a very nutritive thing. It is its nutritive power which gives it its chief excellence, not its intoxicating power; that, it does not possess in its native condition. You cannot get alcohol into anything, by natural process, in which there is not sugar first; and you cannot get alcohol into it then, by natural process, without rotting the sugar.

"The entrance of alcohol then means decay. The coming in of intoxicating power, means the going out of nutritive power. That is, the coming in of the bad means the going out of the good."

"But, may we not have these two different chemical formulæ?"

"Yes. At least we may name their most important constituents. Those which are the chiefest in the one for good, and in the other for harm. While the principal constituents of good wine are not altogether destroyed by fermentation, they are all so largely reduced as to render it of very much less value as a nutritive liquid."

GOOD WINE	BAD WINE
(or unfermented).	(or fermented).

Gluten.	}	(ALCOHOL. Acetic Acid. Enanthic Ether. Extractive. Bouquet.
Gum.		
Aroma.		
Albumen.		Albumen 6/7 gone.
Sugar.		Sugar 5/6 "
Lime.		Lime 1/2 "
Sulphur.		Sulphur 2/7 "
Phosphorus.		Phosphorus 1/2 "

The first three constituents are wholly destroyed by fermentation.

In their place you have five constituents which have no existence in the grape, and do not, therefore, belong at all to wine in its original or native condition.

These owe their existence in the liquid to its natural decay, as poisonous gases soon form within an animal

body after life becomes extinct, especially if in a temperature favorable to decomposition.

The other constituents, as albumen (white of an egg) and sugar, with the lime, sulphur and phosphorus, have been materially diminished, only $\frac{1}{6}$ of the sugar and $\frac{1}{7}$ of the albumen remaining, and the others in like measure also reduced, so that by the process of destruction and addition—the result of fermentation—grape juice loses all the really essential qualities of "*the fruit of the vine*," "*the pure blood of the grape*," or GOOD WINE. Alcoholic wine is not, therefore, "*the fruit of the vine*," and so cannot have been that element which our Lord used in the institution of the Eucharist.

It is said that wine in its unfermented condition comes nearer in its component parts to human blood, than any other liquid of vegetable production known. We see, then, how appropriate it is as an emblem of that blood which was shed for us. And how inappropriate is that liquid which through fermentation and decay contains within it intoxicating, destructive and death-dealing power.

"But, I wish to ask you, Mr. Chemist, this question. Is the formula first given, the regular, ordinary formula for wine as it is found inside the grape?"

"Certainly."

"I have shown from several passages quoted, that that liquid in an unfermented state is called "*wine*," and that it is not at all necessary that fermentation should take place before it may be called wine, taking the Scriptures for our authority. Now, is this first formula God's formula for the making of good wine? Is that the formula after which He is making it now, and always has made it?"

"Yes."

"Then, Mr. Chemist, I want to ask one more question. Do you think that at the marriage feast at Cana, the Lord Jesus Christ, all at once, changed His mind and concluded to make wine out of pure water, not after the formula after which He has always made it, but after that formula condemned by Solomon in the 23rd chapter of Proverbs, and made for His fellow-guests at the feast a wine which His wise father, Solomon, had called a mocker, a serpent and an adder?"

The chemist said, "*I will leave the answer to that question to your own common-sense. Answer it yourself.*"

So we bade the chemist a "Good day," with our best thanks, and hand his last answer over to our readers.

*O Common-sense,
Good gift of God,
Thou art a jewel!*

Did not Christ mean fermented wine, when He said, "No man having tasted the old straightway desires the new, for, he says, the old is better?" I have already shown that Christ's inspired word condemns the use of wine which has in it power to produce woe, and sorrow, and wounds.

Now, we know that fermented wine possesses that power. If there is a passage of His word which appears to lie across that clear and explicit prohibition, I shall have the best wishes of every true Christian when I attempt to clear up any such apparent contradiction, for the servant of Christ, above all other servants longs to be the follower of an ever-consistent Master.

I cannot answer the preceding question in any better way than by giving a little Australian experience.

I called with my wife, and two Christian gentle-

men, both of whom had expressed to me their very strong prejudices against unfermented wine, upon a manufacturer of that article.

I was the spokesman, as our two gentlemen friends, though living quite near, were unacquainted with him.

I told him our errand, and expressed hope that he was meeting with encouragement in his good work, which I regard as a very important factor in the working out of the great temperance problem.

He opened a bottle which had been filled during the grape season of 1887. We all drank.

We all drank, in fact, till we were "well drunk," to use the exact language of Scripture, precisely as we would have done if he had brought us good milk, or lemonade, or water.

After talking over, for a half-hour or so, processes and prospects, he said, "Gentlemen, I would like you to try some I put up four years ago." He went into the cellar and brought a bottle which he uncorked, and when we had tasted it all round, and compared it with the first he had given us, I said, "No man having tasted the old straightway desires the new, because, he says, the old is better."

Here was wine unfermented, uncondemned by God's word, with no more alcohol in it than there is in sweet

cream, or in lemonade, or in water ; and therefore, not only unprohibited by God, but approved and commended. Here was wine greatly improved by age, though it had not been fermented.

Here was light which revealed the blessed truth that Jesus could say that the old was better and yet in no sense contradict His own inspired word, for this old was the better of the two we tasted ; though neither had undergone the process of fermentation.

My two prejudiced friends said they had never before found any in this line so good, and ordered, between them, three dozen bottles for domestic and sacramental purposes, and promised to send larger orders further on.

I have been asked how I would account for its improvement by age. As I would account for the improvement of a Spitzenberg or russet apple between the last of October and the following January. A more perfect blending of components. A toning down to greater delicacy and smoothness.

The best and largest manufacturers I know of, and probably the best in the world, are Frank Wright, Mundy & Co., of Kensington, London, Eng. I have

tasted all their wines, a large variety, and heartily commend them to all Christian people for sacramental, medicinal and domestic uses.

I know them to be, in the fullest sense, what their circulars and their labels allege, "unfermented and non-alcoholic."

To those who have never tasted such wines, let me say a word ; you will be surprised, at the first, to experience a sense of disappointment. Missing the pungency and quick sensation of the alcohol, you will hastily conclude that what you are tasting is, in no sense, wine, but probably cider or other juice with wine flavoring.

You can easily correct your mistake by purchasing a couple of pounds of grapes and squeezing out the juice. You will in this way learn for yourself unmistakably what is the natural taste of unfermented wine.

It is not likely that what you prepare in this way will be as nice as that put up by experienced manufacturers, but at least you can learn so nearly what the pure grape juice tastes like, that you will know when you have a genuine article.

But some will tell you that, even if they knew it was grape juice or unfermented wine, they prefer the other, as this is so insipid.

Yes! I suppose that was about the way Satan talked and Eve thought respecting that other prohibited thing.

"And when the woman saw that the tree was 'good for food,' and that it was 'pleasant to the eyes,' and a tree to be desired to make one wise."

"Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup."

"Pleasant to the eyes, . . . to be desired to make one wise."—red, giving his color in the cup."

Sin in the forefront may sometimes, or always, be more attractive than righteousness, but in the end all is reversed. God expects rational creatures to exercise judgment and common-sense.

We are expected to do better than sing the bacchanalian's song :

"Ave ! color vini clari
Dulcis potus ; non amari,
Tua nos inebriari
Digneris potentia.

"O ! quam placens in colore !
O ! quam fragrans in odore !
O ! quam sapidum in ore !
Dulce linguæ vinculum !"

Which may be translated as follows :

“ Hail, color of bright wine !
Sweet drink ; not bitter,
Thou art worthy that thy power
Should make us drunk !

“ O ! how placid in color !
O ! how fragrant in odor !
O ! how tasty in the mouth !
Thou sweet chain of the tongue.”

I do not mean, after all, that alcohol is a very pleasant thing to the taste, and God's pure juice of the grape an unpleasant thing. It is really not so.

Taste is largely a thing of education, though it may sometimes be the result of natural proclivity.

I presume I could not persuade a donkey that thistles were not good eating, or a goat that old advertisements *pasted* on a fence were not perfectly delicious.

I presume in both cases, I should have my labor for my pains.

I hope, however, to persuade men and women, very especially those who fear and love God, that a taste for what is wrong had better be discouraged, and that a taste for what is in harmony with His truth may be

so cultivated, that in a little time it becomes the much more pleasant of the two.

Persons accustomed for months at a stretch, or perhaps for years, to sleep upon cedar boughs in the bush, or a hard mattress at home, find, at the first, a feather bed very objectionable ; but after even a few weeks experience, you cannot persuade many to go back to earlier and rougher ways of life.

Habits and tastes are largely matters of education.

Many good people have become so accustomed to taste alcohol in wine that when they miss it they think that pure good wine is not wine, because this element, so common to all wines they have ever tasted, is wanting.

Well, I have made a suggestion which may help them.

I do not say that all unfermented wine is nice. There is a right way and a wrong way of doing almost anything you can name.

I sometimes meet with canned fruit which is unpalatable, because it has been put up in a slovenly way, or by a novice.

To myself, or any member of my family, the taste and smell of alcohol are two things most unpleasant, while the taste of unfermented wine is very much

relished. It is not only a very pleasant and refreshing drink, but being highly nutritious, and, best of all, commended of God, it may be taken with a perfect consciousness of divine approval, which gives a blessed relish to all things.

It does not create for itself a beastly and gluttonous appetite like alcoholic beverages.

I read, not long since, of an English squire who rode up to the country "hinn" and said to the boy at the door :

"I seay, lad, I 'ear thou 'ast some good beer 'ere."

"Eiss sur, we has."

"Bring me a quart."

A quart was brought him. He drank it off without taking the mug from his lips, till it was all down.

"Aye, lad," said he, "bring me another quart."

Another quart was brought him. He drank that as he had drunk the former.

"Aye, lad," said he, "I have not been misinformed ; that is good, 'owiver. I think I'll get down and ha'e some."

That is to say, two quarts meant merely a sample. I certainly would not have given my readers this

most ridiculous story if I did not believe it represented actual fact.

Some years ago, I read in one of Mr. Gough's lectures, of a clergyman in England inviting the people of an adjacent parish, where teetotalism prevailed, to come to a "harvest home" in his parish the following week, promising them that they should have something stronger than tea and coffee. "We shall have," said he, "some ale and beer, but remember, friends, only in strict moderation; there will only be *one quart* for each boy, and *two quarts* for each man!"

I was expressing my astonishment to a very good man (a teetotaler), who had grown up to manhood in England, and he said, "Well, that would be '*moderation*.'"

Said I, "What do you mean?"

"Why," said he, "I mean that one quart for each boy and two quarts for each man would be taking it, in their way of thinking, very moderately, for I have frequently known men at such gatherings to drink TWO GALLONS each!"

The tendency of alcoholic drinks is to create an unnatural and beastly appetite. There is no such tendency in non-intoxicating drinks. This is particularly true of unfermented wine.

Nature may desire it, very properly, as nature asks for bread, or milk, or water.

When the immediate and natural demand is met, the craving ceases, as it does for any kind of wholesome food.

How different are the insatiable demands of a vitiated love for alcohol!

Take the alcohol from his beer, and what Englishman or Dutchman could be induced to drink two quarts, to say nothing of two gallons?

Then look at the poor wretch who has become diseased by alcohol.

As the dog to his vomit, as the sow to the mire, so he returns to his beverage with an appetite which can suffer no denial.

Though perfectly conscious he may go again into the ditch, or make his bed with the swine, he cannot resist this horrible craving.

"Yea, thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast."

"They have stricken me, shalt thou say, and I was not sick; they have beaten me, and I felt it not: when shall I awake? I will seek it yet again." (Prov. xxiii. 34, 35.)

Does not Paul sanction, by implication, the moderate

use of intoxicating wine, when he exhorts Timothy to be careful to choose deacons who are *not given to much wine*?

If it were unfermented and, therefore, harmless, why mention it at all?

If wrong to drink any, even a little of the fermented, then why say "not given to much?"

Conclusion speedily reached: It cannot be wrong to take a little fermented wine.

Yes. Conclusions speedily reached are sometimes very erroneous. Error will sometimes walk a league while truth is pulling on its boots.

All truth lovers will be very sorry if that rock should move to which we anchored, in the 23rd chapter of Proverbs, "Look not upon the wine when" it ferments, for then it is a mocker, a serpent, and an adder.

I have thoroughly established this important point in our argument, that there was *wine* in Bible times, as there is now, which did not intoxicate.

I have not for a moment lost sight of the fact that there was also wine, and probably much of it, in Bible times, which could and did intoxicate.

It was then, as now, a source of temptation.

Those who indulged in it, did so, not merely because

they loved its taste, but because of the hilarity and good fellowship attending the drinking of it.

These hilarious drinkers were called "wine-bibbers."

The drinking of the good tended no further than the proper gratification of the honest and ordinary demands of nature. The whole tendency of the bad was not only by evil companionship, but by the vitiating nature of the poison of alcohol towards "much" and more, and much more, down to the most besotted drunkenness.

Although these men may have sometimes used the unfermented, yet, the moment they were "given to much," or had a desire in the direction of "much," they were not likely to distinguish between the bad and the good.

The good, in small quantity, only as nature demanded; the bad, in larger quantity (much), as hilarity, bad companionship and a growing bad habit demanded. Talk is good. It is necessary. It is very useful, though there is talk that is bad, very bad. Show me a man or woman "given to much" talk, and I show you a tattler, one not likely to distinguish between talk that is good and talk that is bad; a busybody, a disturber of the peace and harmony of a neighborhood.

"Not given to much wine," in Paul's mouth, or under Paul's pen, does not necessarily mean, by even the most strained implication, a sanctioning of the use of bad wine, not even in the smallest quantities.

Some persons think they see, in 1 Cor. xi. 21, a recognition on the part of Paul, of the harmlessness of intoxicating wine, if moderately used. For the life of me, I cannot see what there is in the passage to enable any one to so construe it, even if you take with it all that part of the chapter which has any reference to the use of wine. "For in eating, every one taketh before other, his own supper: and one is hungry and another is drunken." To go into a lengthy explanation of the passage, I should have to resort to (that which I have all along purposely avoided) the use of Latin, Greek and Hebrew words for wine, drinking, drunkenness, etc.

All these words for wine, etc., in all these ancient languages, are here before me while I write, with definitions, explanations, comments, reasonable, satisfactory and abundant.

I have intentionally avoided quoting, not merely

these words from dead languages, but, to any great extent, the words or comments of learned men.

I have assumed that, through God's good mercy, the holy Scriptures were so correctly translated three hundred years ago into the English language, that we who speak and read this tongue might all know His will respecting this very important matter, if we would diligently seek after a knowledge of His will.

I will content myself, however, respecting the passage under consideration, with giving very briefly the views of some of the most learned and pious writers.

Instead of the word "drunken," some of these writers put in others to explain what it here means.

Macknight says : "One is hungry and another is *filled, plentifully fed.*"

Wesley puts it : "The poor who cannot provide for themselves have nothing, while the rich eat and drink *to the full.*"

Bloomfield : "The word requires to be interpreted only of *satiety* in both eating and drinking, we need not to suppose any drunkenness or gluttony."

Dr. A. Clarke : "One is hungry and another is drunken—*filled to the full* ; this is the sense of the word in many places of Scripture."

So there is in 1 Cor. xi., absolutely nothing to

justify the opinion that Paul, in the least degree, winked at or sanctioned the use, even the most moderate use, of intoxicating wine.

Well, did not Paul give up and abstain from the use of intoxicating wine for his brother's sake?

No! Paul never abstained from the use of an intoxicant for his brother's sake.

Did Paul abstain from murder and theft for his brother's sake?

He abstained from these for his own sake; because these were wrong.

Do you think he did not know what Solomon had written? Was he not learned in the law?

Could he have had a conscience void of offence towards God and man if he had made use of that which the wise preacher of his ancestral line had compared to a mocker, serpent and adder, producing by its bite "woe and sorrow, babbling and wounds," enjoining and commanding all his sons not even to "*look upon it?*"

This doctrine of expediency, founded on Paul's

supposed abstemiousness from intoxicants for his brother's sake, must be set aside.

It is wrong, it is dishonoring to both Paul and his great Master.

It is misleading. It has done harm, because misleading.

It leaves us standing on very unsafe ground in more respects than one.

When we think we are at liberty to abstain from the beverage use of an intoxicant, merely on the ground of voluntary magnanimity, which we may exercise or not, just as we choose, we are standing on very unsafe ground. Those who hold the opinion that Paul abstained from intoxicants for his brother's sake hold also the opinion that Paul's Master, Christ, did not abstain from the use of intoxicants.

Can my reader see no incongruity here? Can it be that that the servant and the Lord were so much at variance, the servant appearing the better of the two?

If it had reference to men of this world merely, we might pass it by as something not so very uncommon; but when it means a lowering of this Master below that of His servant, we must seek after something better.

A minister exhorted to abstain, and Paul's example being put before him, has been known to say with the "mock, serpent and adder" in his glass, "You can be a follower of Paul if you wish, I am content to be a follower of Jesus Christ."

Poor fellow ; little did he think while claiming to be a follower of Jesus, that he was a blind dupe of that serpent that deceived our first mother in the garden of Eden.

"This doctrine of expediency supposes that Christ was accustomed to drink intoxicating wine, but that Paul abstained for the sake of his weak brethren. Here Paul is supposed to have raised the Gospel standard higher than his Divine Master. Christ did not raise it high enough, or Paul raised it too high. If so, which of their examples are we to follow?"

—Rev. T. Pearson.

On what evidence have we, in the past, grounded our belief that Christ was accustomed to use *intoxicating* wine?

On no evidence whatever except a Jewish slander.

There was no more ground for believing that Christ was a wine-bibber, than for believing that John had a devil.

Christ was as free from the intoxicating wine as John was from the devil.

If ever there was a moment in His life when He would have used an intoxicating wine, it was when it would have (mingled with myrrh) been to Him an anodyne to allay His awful suffering on the cross. Even then He refused it.

This doctrine of expediency represents Paul as more disposed than Christ to exercise self-denial for others' sake.

It puts Paul before us as more charitable than Christ. It cannot, therefore, be true.

If we regard Christ as accustomed to drink intoxicating wine, it is utterly impossible for us to reconcile His example with the law of charity inculcated by Paul.

If we regard Paul as abstaining from something bad (which we have seen was prohibited), we are attributing to him too low a motive for his noble act.

If we regard him as abstaining from something in no sense whatever condemned, something rather commended and approved, and spoken of as a blessing—and something perfectly "lawful," as he says, we heighten the nobility of his act, and exalt still higher his magnanimity.

When Paul surrenders what is good for the sake of others, we see him following in the footsteps of his self-denying Lord, "who, though He was rich, for our sakes became poor."

I may make myself more clearly understood if I suppose that it was milk which a heathen offered to his idol.

In that case we should have read, "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink *milk*, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak."

Paul did not abstain from the use of the wine in this respect on alcoholic grounds, or non-alcoholic, for that matter, but wholly on recognition or non-recognition of idolatrous practices.

May I put it in this way? Paul, having finished and sold his tent, and paid the cloth dealer and the cord spinner, went with the profits of his toil into the shambles, to buy provision for dinner.

Having paid for the half of the leg of a kid, he asked for a pint of wine. Unknown to the dealer, he was offered some fermented wine, but he refused it. The dealer understood what was meant, and immediately produced from the big jar sunk in the ground, a pint of the better sort.

A few hours after, two young converts to Christianity came in, and asked, "Did we not see you, Paul, purchase half the leg of a kid, and a pint of wine in the shambles, to-day?"

They were told that it might have been so, as he had purchased these to-day in the shambles.

They said, "Do you know, Paul, that we saw an idolator purchase some of that same meat, and some of that same wine, and offer it to his idol?"

They were told that might have been so.

They said, "Well, Paul, we think you are sanctioning idolatry by eating and drinking of the same meat and wine offered to the idol."

Paul said, "No, brethren, I am not disposed to recognize the idol, even so far as that, for 'an idol is nothing in the world,' in my way of thinking."

"But," they said, "we think you are doing so, Paul, even though you think otherwise, and your course greatly injures our faith. You put a stumbling-block in our way; and when we see you using the same meat and drinking the same drink as are offered to the idols, we feel that it is as well to serve the idol as it is to serve the unseen Lord whom you preach to us."

So Paul, without further reasoning said, "Very well

brethren, I will forego the meat and the wine. I will eat lentiles, parched corn, or parched pulse, anything, rather than offend your consciences."

Neither Paul nor his Master used intoxicating drinks. How could the Master? For was it not by His own inspiration condemned?

How could Paul, whose whole being was made subject to the law of Christ?

What he gave up for the sake of others was that which was not condemned or prohibited.

If my reader asks what kind of wine it was the idolater offered to his idol, I reply by pointing to the heathen of to-day, comparing them with Christians as regards the use of intoxicants.

Is it not enough to bring the blush to the cheek of every true follower of Jesus?

The sober nations of this age are the heathen nations, the drunken nations are the Christian nations.

And mightier efforts are being made now, than ever before, by Christian nations, especially by England and America, for the sake of gain, to turn the sober heathen into drunkards.

I have lived in the midst of Chinamen for years. I have seen them by the ten thousand in British Colum-

bia, California and Australia, and I never saw, in my life, but one Chinaman intoxicated.

If the heathen would not drink it themselves (there are exceptions, and always have been ; I refer to the general rule), they were not very likely to offer it to their idols. I have fully established the fact that in ancient times there was wine that did not intoxicate, and it is very much more reasonable to suppose that it was this sort that was offered to the idol, and we may be positively certain it was this sort from which Paul abstained for his brethren's sake. From the other he abstained because it was denounced, condemned and prohibited in that Word, which was to him the light of life.

Paul had heard from Timothy, that he was not strong. He knew, also, that Timothy had very closely followed his example respecting his abstinence from the use of wine, for the sake of the weak consciences of some young converts. Paul felt anxious that Timothy should not only live as long as possible, but that he should be as efficient as possible in his great work of preaching the Gospel, and building up the Church. He felt that Timothy should have some-

thing more nourishing and nutritive than the plain fare to which he had accustomed himself.

He wrote him, therefore, to desist somewhat from that over-conscientiousness regarding these brethren whose consciences ought to be by this time better informed, and take a little of that "pure blood of the grape," which had been one of the chiefest of the blessings promised by God to their nation.

I ask any man of intelligence and ordinary common-sense to take this thought which I have here given, and compare it with the history of wine through the whole Bible, and see if it is not more in harmony with truth than the contradictory view held by so many in the past. A view which has led, I fear, to the ruin of thousands.

O Christians! O Christian fathers and mothers, will you yet continue to place on your tables and bring into your houses this cursed thing, disowned of God and denounced? Do you not know that thousands and tens of thousands have gone to ruin through temptations set before them in their own homes?

Do not lay the blame on God, for God tempteth no man.

Do not lay blame on Jesus or Paul for setting an example which others, trying to follow, have lost their

souls and everything else dear to humanity. Neither Jesus nor Paul ever set an example which, if followed, led to ruin. It is a lie invented of hell for the destruction of those for whom Christ died.

The use of intoxicating beverages and "the whole liquor traffic is contrary to the Word of God and the spirit of the Christian religion, and there is no cure for it but its total prohibition."

Reader, you and I must soon appear at the judgment seat of Christ. Will you not join with me, and shall we not both join hand to hand and heart to heart with all others who love God and the human race, in abolishing this unspeakable and indescribable evil?—AMEN!

er
d,
c-
le
ne
e
r-
d
o
n
e

